

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 BRETT LEE WILLIAMS,  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 v.  
13 T. E. HILL, et al.,  
14 Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00540-LJO-EPG (PC)  
ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE OF  
CORRECTIONS  
(ECF NO. 31)

15 Brett Williams (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights  
16 action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

17 On November 14, 2017, the Court entered an order granting Plaintiff’s motions for  
18 extension of time. (ECF No. 30). Plaintiff was given until February 6, 2018, to file his  
19 response to the Court’s order to show cause, and was told that no further extensions would be  
20 granted. (Id.).

21 On December 11, 2017, Plaintiff filed a “notice of corrections.” (ECF No. 31).  
22 Plaintiff argues that he is entitled to application of the mailbox rule, and “prays that this Court  
23 makes the correction under the mailbox rule....”

24 The Court will not make any corrections to its prior order. Plaintiff is correct that he is  
25 entitled to the application of the mailbox rule. Douglas v. Noelle, 567 F.3d 1103, 1107 (9th  
26 Cir. 2009). However, the application of the mailbox rule does not require a change to the  
27 Court’s order. The Court granted Plaintiff’s extension of time requests. While the Court  
28

1 ordered that no further extensions will be granted, that part of the order had nothing to do with  
2 when Plaintiff's requests were filed. The limitation was because Plaintiff had "already been  
3 granted an extension of time," and because "there has not been an operative complaint in this  
4 case since April of 2017...." (ECF No. 30, p. 1).

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: December 13, 2017

8 /s/ Eric P. Groj  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE